

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2015**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, in attendance, held a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. at the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury, Connecticut.

1. Roll Call

Council Members

Dr. Stewart Beckett III, Chairman
Mr. Whit C. Osgood, Vice Chairman
Mrs. Jill Barry
Ms. Karen Boisvert
Mr. Lawrence J. Byar
Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh
Mr. William T. Finn
Mr. Thomas P. Gullotta
Mrs. Cara (Tonucci) Keefe

(a) Pledge of Allegiance

Led by Chairman Beckett

2. Public Comment.

Mr. William Vincelette of Tall Timbers Drive represented GHS wrestling team and said that they do not have an appropriate amount of space. He said that they currently have to bus the students off site which is also problematic. He noted the support for the weight and locker room and felt that this was an opportunity to incorporate multi-purpose space that wrestling could use for their program. He noted that wrestling is the oldest sport, one that doesn't discriminate for body size and that there has been no championship in town since 1978 questioning if it is because of a lack of appropriate facilities. He passed out potential plans for the space. He said that they have had to limit the number of athletes due to the lack of space. He noted the lack of equity with student athletes in other sports getting twice the amount of practice time.

Mr. Kevin Vigeant of Island Green noted the bussing to Gideon is problematic for many factors but one being that there are no trainers at Gideon thus creating a time lag to get a trainer to an athlete when needed. He emphasized that while wrestling is in need of this space, student athletes for many other sports are stretching in hallways instead of having a more appropriate space. He said this is the ideal time to incorporate this with the weight and locker rooms.

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------|-------------|
| 3. | Special Reports. | <i>None</i> |
| 4. | Old Business. | <i>None</i> |
| 5. | New Business. | |

(a) Action on transfer from Contingency – fuel cell landscaping.

Mr. Johnson briefly reviewed his memo on the topic to the Council dated November 24, 2015, noting two parts to augment the planting between Hebron Avenue and the facility. He said the first is the planting of 6 trees from the town nursery and the second is the purchase of 8 other trees to implement the town planting plan. Mr. Byar said he was very happy to hear the siting council approved the site planting plan. He thanked staff and their state representatives for their help, said this made sense and expressed support. Vice Chairman Osgood asked if the plan to the siting council included these plantings. Mr. Johnson said it included much of this but the plants in the nursery may not have been noted specifically.

Vice Chairman Osgood noted that the plan on the site of the facility will need years to grow and asked about the location for these. Mr. Johnson reiterated that these would fill in between Hebron Avenue and the facility on MDC land not under the applicant control. Vice Chairman Osgood said he had an issue with using town funds to buffer a development in town and might vote against it on principal but also noted the tax revenues. Mr. Finn expressed support of the action to facilitate the need of their constituents to mitigate the concerns for a greater buffer. Mr. Gullotta agreed with Mr. Finn. Chairman Beckett agreed as well, adding that he thought it would be okay as previously planted but with the leaves down, it is clear that more buffer is needed.

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approved a \$16,500 transfer from Contingency to Parks & Recreation/Capital Outlay-Land & Buildings for additional landscaping at the fuel cell located off Chalker Hill, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated November 24, 2015.

Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

(b) Discussion and possible action concerning town-owned property at 1056 New London Turnpike.

Mr. Johnson briefly reviewed his memo on the topic to the Council dated November 24, 2015, emphasizing that they could mothball the home, remove it largely with town forces or repair and lease it with the likelihood of making their money back. He noted that they could use the garage for storage. Vice Chairman Osgood asked if the realtor thought they could lease it to which Mr. Johnson replied saying yes. Vice Chairman Osgood expressed support for repair and lease. Mr. Cavanaugh asked about the payback information. Mr. Johnson said that a \$35,000 investment has a two-year payback with the purchase, price and lost taxes as a sunk cost. Mr. Cavanaugh

said it was similar to Douglas and New London Turnpike and advocated to let the police and fire use it for tactical exercises and then they could burn it down.

Mr. Finn said he agreed with Mr. Cavanaugh, it is a substandard property not appealing for a family given it is on a main road and suggested it be used by fire and police if desired. Mrs. Barry expressed support for the \$35,000 for improvements given there was no immediate use. She supported renovating and leasing the home adding that the Douglas Road property was purchased to move the intersection. Mr. Gullotta said he was opposed to the purchase and found it curious they now seem to be unsure what to do with the property. Mr. Byar asked where the \$35,000 would come from. Mr. Johnson said that it would likely come from the Capital Reserve –unassigned fund balance unless the decision was to demolish where the \$10,000 would likely come out of contingency.

Vice Chairman Osgood said that he wasn't overly excited about this purchase but it could improve access to GHS at some point in the future. He said that in the meantime, the town could make money. Mrs. Keefe asked about the rent and Mr. Johnson said about \$1,900. Mrs. Keefe said that she questioned how rentable the property would be given the proximity to Conestoga Way. Mr. Johnson said it was hard to say for certain but they have used the advice of this realtor in the past and have been successful. Ms. Boisvert asked how long it had been unoccupied and Mr. Johnson estimated about a year but was uncertain. Ms. Boisvert asked if they had any future plans but Mr. Johnson said not now. Ms. Boisvert expressed support for spending the \$35,000 and renting the property. Chairman Beckett said he supported the purchase for the future need for access but supported spending the money to renovate and rent in the meantime. Mrs. Byar expressed support for spending the money and renting for now. He added that he agreed that it wasn't conducive to a family rental.

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh

Seconded By:

Mr. Gullotta

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers the request for a \$35,000 transfer from the Capital Reserve-Unassigned Fund Balance to Capital Projects-Site Demolition and Restoration, to the Board of Finance for a funding report and recommendation; and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 12, 2016 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury, to consider said appropriation and transfer.

Result: Motion carries by the following vote {7-2-0}.

For: Chairman Beckett, Mrs. Barry, Ms. Boisvert, Mr. Byar, Mr. Finn, Mr. Gullotta and Mrs. Keefe

Against: Vice Chairman Osgood and Mr. Cavanaugh

Abstain: None

(c) Discussion concerning proposed improvements to Town Hall – site and building.

Mr. Johnson briefly reviewed his memo on the topic to the Council dated November 24, 2015, and reviewed the plans including the elements: planted raised berm, green space over the existing parking circle, changed parking against the sidewalk for safety and realignment with Douglas since repaving will be necessary anyway. He noted the entrance to Town Hall lacks

identity while he showed the plans for improvement including the elements: Main Street facing door, customer service area, patio area linked to the sidewalk system, new lighting package and sign package. He said that it is about 1,000 square feet and they would plan to handle some business at the desk. He said that they would like to build next spring before the 2016 election and thus, would like to go to local permitting now.

Mr. Byar said he would like to see the cost of the site work and building plans. He noted that the dark is a safety issue and he likes the format. He asked if there would be need for the parking they are proposing turn into green space. Mr. Johnson said that they have would get more use out of pedestrian friendly green space. Mr. Byar said he wanted to be sure people could conduct business. Mr. Johnson said that they estimate \$300K for the site and \$250K for internal. He said that they hope the \$300K goes a long way because the initial estimate was \$350K and they know they need to replace the front door and bricks. Ms. Boisvert commented on the Main Street door being set back 70' from the street side of the building.

Mr. Gullotta asked if they would be locked into landscaping if they okay it. Mr. Johnson said that they would like to go to the other Commissions and get input. Mr. Gullotta questioned whether they need to worry about the lack of alignment. Mr. Johnson said that the realignment is not a significant expense given the work that must be done anyway and it would give the Town Hall more green space. Mr. Gullotta noted that they would be reducing the green space at the house they lease. He said he would support it going forward but may want to tweak it a bit. Mr. Cavanaugh asked how long approvals last if they don't go forward with it right away. Mr. Johnson said 1 year adding that he would touch base with the Town Council along the way.

Vice Chairman Osgood said he was concerned about the realignment and that it would detract from the rental and said that he saw no value in the Main Street entrance. Mr. Johnson noted that the traffic circle goes largely unused and was uncertain there would be much savings in the eliminating those proposed changes. Vice Chairman Osgood said to get rid of the Main Street door and move the building to the south and that he was okay with the green space. Mrs. Keefe said she favored the green space and asked about picnic tables. Mr. Johnson said that he anticipated the space to be used by staff and residents. Mrs. Keefe added that there is a connection to the dog park and that green space would benefit the residents. She said that the Main Street door seems counter to the effort to save energy without much benefit.

Mr. Byar noted the differing opinions. Regarding the re-alignment, he said that one purpose for purchasing the property next door was to facilitate the realignment of Douglas and he didn't think they should take it off the table. He added that he would like to hear from the police department. Mrs. Barry said she loved the proposed plans as they are with the green space, the realignment and the Main Street entrance. Chairman Beckett agreed with Mrs. Barry adding that he had seen a number of near misses at Douglas plus the added cost for the realignment is insignificant. He said that he was hoping the Main Street door would be more prominent but felt that they should have a welcoming door to Main Street.

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Byar
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to present the proposed site and exterior building improvements through the local review and

approval process as generally described in a report by the Town Manager dated November 24, 2015.

Disc: Vice Chairman Osgood said that they should send on the plan as it is noting that he doesn't like the offsetting building or the realignment. Mr. Finn said he had reservations and was critical of the Main Street presence. He favored the green space but felt the entrances were plain vanilla and they could do better. Mr. Johnson noted that it was a balance of a functional space with cost and he'd like to get some input from the other commissions. Chairman Beckett echoed Mr. Johnson about hearing from the other boards and commissions. Mr. Cavanaugh said that all the comments would be part of the record. Mr. Johnson said he would circle back to the Council. Vice Chairman Osgood and Mr. Finn expressed support for this motion with the understanding their input will be shared and it would come back to the Council.

Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

JOINT PRELIMINARY PUBLIC HEARINGS – 8:00 P.M.

NO. 1 Application of Hawthorn Development, LLC – Preliminary PAD Development Plan (w/Text Amendment) or Regulation Text Amendment & Special Permit Approval – construction & operation of a 4-story, 142± suite retirement community/congregate facility – located on 5.3± acres on the easterly side of Eastern Blvd (between 94 & 148) being a portion of 155 Addison Rd – Carol A. & Richard J. Gutt, Trustees, owners

Joining the Town Council were TPZ Commissioners: Sharon Purtill, Chairman, Keith Shaw, Raymond Hassett, Michael Bothelo and William Wulfange. Attorney Alter represented the applicants and was joined by Mark Lowen, Land Use Manager and Dan Roach, Architect. Attorney Alter reviewed the 5.3 acre site part of the Gutt family farm saying that most is zoned for Planned Employment while a portion is residential. He asked the Council to consider conveying a 15' strip of land that would give them access to the Planned Employment side of their property noting that they are prohibited from accessing it through residential and there are substantial wetlands in the middle. He also asked for a policy decision, a text amendment to the PAD Regulation or Planned Employment Zone to allow the proposed use. He said that making the change was consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development to provide multi-level elderly housing or care buffering to residential on properties with limitations like wetlands. He noted that they adopted the plan but did not incorporate it into their building zone regulations. He said that it was unlikely in the foreseeable future that an office building would be developed given the empty buildings in town.

Mr. Lowen explained that Hawthorn was a family owned company and they buy, build and operate their properties that are not medical facilities. He said that 80% of the residents are from the area while about 20% come from other areas to be close to loved ones from the area. He said most are single and don't drive. He noted that they offer 3 meals per day, 7 days per week,

activities every 2 hours, linen service, on-site management, pull cords for help, van service, chapel, beauty salon, exercise space, movies and family gathering space all part of the rent. He noted that access to medical facilities is important and their traffic impact is low. He said that they like green space and plan walking paths to loop the entire site. He noted that while the wetlands present a challenge, they also see them as a visual asset. He said that they don't have kitchens with ovens or stoves but may offer a sink. He explained the 30% building common area, four-story 120,000 square foot building on a 35,000 square foot footprint. He said that they are low impact on town services and create jobs. He noted the park like setting that welcome residents.

Ms. Boisvert asked about walkability. Attorney Alter said that due to lack of sidewalks, there are limited off-site opportunities so access to the medical facilities would be by van. TPZ Chairman Purtill asked about the other portion of the property and Attorney Alter said that they do not propose to cross the wetlands. She asked if they would be landlocked if they don't get the zone change in the back and Attorney Alter said that they may be able to go through the Flanagan property. She said that the strip of land was up to the Council but that she felt that this site was natural for office. She continued saying that it seemed like a nice development but it would be better suited for another area.

Mr. Gullotta said he felt it was appropriate and that the Council would more likely be interested in selling the strip of land instead of conveying it. Mr. Cavanaugh agreed with TPZ Chairman Purtill. He asked Attorney Alter if he represented the owners for the residential development coming forward in the next six to eight months to which Attorney Alter replied saying yes. TPZ Chairman Purtill asked about the zone line which Attorney Alter noted on the plans. Mr. Cavanaugh said he would be a no but should it proceed, he would prefer the PAD path. Mr. Byar asked if their intent was for immediate subdivision. Attorney Alter said if approved, the 5.3 acre site would be separated. Mr. Byar echoed the other remarks that there is value to the strip of land and the town might entertain a mutually acceptable exchange. He said he liked the site layout but would have to give more thought to whether it was appropriate.

Mr. Gullotta asked about taxes. Attorney Alter said that this is a \$10-14 Million project producing significant tax dollars. Chairman Beckett agreed with Mr. Gullotta and thought that the employment of 30 people would be more than an office development of the site, they need the variety of housing so seniors can stay in town and that this would benefit the town. Mrs. Keefe said that she agreed with the need for housing variety and asked about their demographics. Mr. Lowen said their typical resident is a female in her early 80's and their aim is the retired school teacher with a pension and social security, it wasn't government or subsidized. She asked about the two bedroom units and Mr. Lowen said that it could be for husband and wife or sisters or for a resident to have a room for an activity like quilting.

TPZ Commissioner Wulftange asked about monthly rent. Mr. Dan Roach said that rents were not established but they would range from \$2500 - \$3500 per month with no buy in fees to be in financial reach for all income ranges. Mr. Finn asked about the land use conflict with the plan of conservation and development and Attorney Alter explained that the building zone regulations

were not updated to incorporate the ability to allow this type of development in the PAD or Planned Employment zones. Mr. Finn said that he would consider that further echoing that the land would only be available for compensation. He expressed support for the variety of housing and the PAD route. He felt it was a unique opportunity that fits in with the general area making a good use of the nearby medical. He questioned the 55+ community tag when it seems as if they are describing a retirement community. Mr. Lowen said that they can work with the town on that.

Vice Chairman Osgood said that it was a nice presentation and product but there was a very limited amount of Planned Employment zone left. He said that he would be more likely to support this on the other side of the property off Addison leaving the rest Planned Employment. TPZ Commissioner Bothelo said it was a good project addressing a growing need but he wasn't convinced this was the right location particularly using their valuable Planned Employment zone. Mrs. Barry praised the project agreeing that there is a need in town and asked how long it takes to fill up based on prior experience. Mr. Lowen said that their goal is 12 months but they had two to three facilities that filled in three to six months. TPZ Commissioner Wulftange asked what use there would be if they had no access. Attorney Alter said a farm and explained the dilemma of the two zones where they are prohibited from accessing the PE zone from residential. Ms. Boisvert said that she liked the project but not the location. Mr. Roach said that they aren't concerned about the residents for the development as they find it attractive for a lot of reasons. TPZ Chairman Purtill said that this is a long time zone for this area and they have held fast against other developments being told the same story about the economy and now they have a wonderful medical complex. Chairman Beckett said that 30-40 jobs wouldn't occur in a residential use and said to ignore that would be short-sighted. Attorney Alter said that this parcel has been on the market for five years and this is the first contract. He noted that it is in 490 with the town getting about \$100 per year in taxes.

Vice Chairman Osgood asked about the Hearth. Mr. Johnson said that the amendment to the Plan of Conservation and Development was the precursor and it went forward as a PAD within the Planned Employment zone. Vice Chairman Osgood asked if it was a permitted use to which Mr. Johnson replied saying no. Vice Chairman Osgood expressed preference for development as Planned Employment and that a 30,000 square foot building would likely have more like 120 employees. Attorney Alter noted the consensus for monetary terms for the strip of land but asked about the PAD or PE. Mr. Gullotta said PAD. Chairman Beckett and Ms. Boisvert expressed no opinion. Attorney Alter noted three in opposition, three ambivalent and four in support overall. Chairman Beckett also noted the suggestion to relocate on the site. Hearing nothing further, he closed the public hearing.

The meeting recessed at 9:33 pm and reconvened at 9:39 pm.

NO. 2 Application of Glastonbury Commons, LLC – Changes to the Approved Final Development Plan associated with construction of a multi-family community comprised of 155 apartment homes - 2.94± acres - 75 Glastonbury Blvd w/in Somerset Square PAD – PRA AT SOMERSET, LLC, owner.

Attorney Peter Alter represented the developer and explained the site is in front of the two hotels and has remained vacant while all the other lots were developed. He noted that it was originally going to be the twin of the west building sharing a lawn in between. He spoke to the 2008 application for 155 residential units with the same footprint but underground parking that gave rise to soil condition concerns and the project didn't go forward. He then spoke to the 2012 request to reduce the number of units and change the parking but the developer walked away while TPZ and the Town Council went back and forth about whether it represented a major or minor change.

He continued saying that in 2013, a developer went into administrative review with an assisted living facility but stopped after that part of the process. He reviewed the subject proposal for the same number of units as the latest approved plan saying that while the configuration and parking changed, the amassing and height would not. He said the mix of units changed, the number of spaces is the same but instead of underground, it would be under the building and surface parking. He said they eliminated the tandem spaces. He said this was a concept but if favorable, they would begin final plans with TPZ and back to the Town Council. He said it is viewed as a major amendment, WPCA and the owners in the common interest community will have to review as well as the likelihood of an administrative review for STC.

Mr. Frank Kiko, developer for Spinnaker, spoke to the company's efforts to choose infill sites and create a lifestyle with their developments that typically don't attract families. He noted one of their developments across from Norwalk Aquarium saying that their track record speaks for itself. He said that they tried to be creative in their plan to redevelop the site and addressing the parking issue saying that it is proposed as a u-shaped building with the parking in the center screened from, and set back off, Glastonbury Boulevard. He noted the wide drive saying that the proposed angled parking along the drive and noted elements such as a fitness center, lounge and top floor lofts. He said it was similar in scale and massing and reviewed the elevations noting the location of mechanicals on the roof behind parapets.

Mr. Bill Wenc represented owners of 45 Glastonbury Boulevard saying that part of the issue with the plan is 42 spaces are off this site and our parking is already stressed with the hotels and Maggie McFly's making use of it. He said that there is aesthetic value to the access road expressing concern about the use of it for parking. He said that the developer needs 100% support from the association and they are not excited about it. He emphasized that the use is not objectionable if the parking could be accommodated on their own site. He asked if it was six stories.

Mr. Kiko replied saying no but it might look that way because of the parapets. Attorney Alter said that there is a provision in the master plan that the residential use is not permitted unless

there is 100% consent as the former applicant never sought that approval. He said that the record documents assign 42 spaces on 45 Glastonbury Boulevard to this site and is a matter of right regardless of any recognition of parking issues with the other developments. TPZ Commissioner Hassett asked if they had exclusive right to the 42 spaces to which Mr. Alter replied indicating no. Mr. Byar said he would love to see the development and that apartments add to the vitality of the area. He expressed concern, however, of the 30% increase in bedrooms from 193 to 250 and the increase in 2-bedroom units are far more conducive to family living. He noted the 1.45 spaces per bedroom being reduced to 1.11 spaces per bedroom adding that parking is a challenge.

Attorney Alter suggested there were inconsistencies in the TPZ parking regulations and the PAD regulations don't have any guidance but he has never calculated parking spaces per bedroom. He added that if that is the desire, the town should change the regulations. Regarding the number of 2-bedroom units, the developer is responding to the market for young professionals joining to upgrade living style or a couple that wants the extra room but it doesn't generate family occupancy. Mr. Kiko said that this is preliminary, they are making a conscious effort to target a mature audience and they are comfortable with 1.8 spaces per unit. TPZ Commissioner Shaw said flipping the number of more 2-bedroom and less 1-bedroom units, questioning how they could not factor in that there would be many more residents needing parking. Attorney Alter said the site was over parked from the start.

Vice Chairman Osgood stated that he didn't think parking along the access road is a good idea and criticized the loss of outdoor common space and views being the parking lot questioning the appeal. TPZ Chairman Purtill expressed concern over the loss of the sunken lawn between the properties delegated to parking and the additional parking along the access road. She said that they may have to scale back on the units and asked about lighting and square footage of the units. Mr. Kiko said this is preliminary and there will be more details to come but the average unit is 1,000 square feet thus ranging from 800 to 1,200 square foot units with a building gross being just under 288,000 square feet. She asked about the rents to which Mr. Kiko said a 1-bedroom \$1700 and 2-bedroom \$2,500 to \$2,800.

Mr. Cavanaugh said he would like to see something happen and asked about the ownership, loss of the sunken lawn and how close it is proposed to the other buildings. Attorney Alter said that it is owned by one of Mr. Paccetti's companies and the wings of the building are outside the lawn. Mr. Kiko reviewed the plans. Mr. Cavanaugh said the lawn is important and asked about encroachment. Mr. Kiko said the problem is it impacts density and economics. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that he agreed with the concerns raised by others about the parking issues and parking on the access drive. He asked about the STC approval. Mr. Kiko said there was an STC approval on the previous plan but it has expired so they will have to go back. Mr. Cavanaugh reiterated that he would like to see it developed and the developer should take into consideration the concerns.

Ms. Boisvert favored development but was concerned about the parking ratio and the 42 spaces being taxed by others. She said that she also did not favor the parking on the access drive. Mr.

Finn suggested that they give the water table and development in the area greater scrutiny due to the issues but he would like to see it developed. He spoke to their pride in this development. Vice Chairman Osgood stated that he would not want to see the parking sticking out in view of Glastonbury Boulevard and that their expectations are that the building materials and constructions would be the same and same quality as the rest of the developments. Hearing nothing further, Chairman Beckett closed the public hearing.

6. Consent Calendar.

None

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Johnson briefly reviewed his report to the Council dated November 24, 2015, noting that the Griswold intersection realignment is done and he wanted to see if there was a consensus on continuing the lease for 1098 New London Turnpike. A consensus was expressed to renew the lease at 1098 New London Turnpike. Mr. Cavanaugh said that the town is 100% better with the removal of the temporary signs. Vice Chairman Osgood said he was pleased with the Matson Hill Open Space but asked why they don't mow the whole lawn and if there was any money for a simple concrete cap. He also asked for someone to look into the comment about parking regulations being inconsistent. He praised the sidewalk projects. Mr. Finn asked about the golf course saying it looks great. Mr. Johnson said that they would get information after they have closed at year end. Chairman Beckett echoed the praise of the sidewalks. Mrs. Keefe suggested that dog disposal product stands at Hubbard Green be duplicated in the town center.

8. Committee Reports.

(a) Chairman's Report.

(b) Subcommittee Report:

- **Rules of Procedure Subcommittee**

Mr. Finn said it was his pleasure to work with Mrs. Keefe and Mr. Johnson and their recommendation is to allow electronic communication of a packet for a special or emergency meeting.

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the proposed changes to the Council Rules of Procedure to amend Section 2 – Special Meetings, Section 3 – Emergency Meetings, and Section 6(c) – Agenda, in accordance with the updated document dated November 24, 2015 and as recommended by the Council Rules of Procedure Subcommittee.

Disc: Vice Chairman Osgood confirmed with Mr. Johnson that he was comfortable with the change.

Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby extends its meeting 30 minutes.

Result: Motion carries by the following vote {8-1-0}.

For: Chairman Beckett, Vice Chairman Osgood, Mrs. Barry, Ms. Boisvert, Mr. Byar, Mr. Finn, Mr. Gullotta and Mrs. Keefe

Against: Mr. Cavanaugh

Abstain: None

9. Communications.

- (a) Letter from Glastonbury Board of Education regarding air-conditioning for various school buildings.
- (b) Thank you e-mail from Anne Pratson regarding driveway entrance to Soap Factory.
- (c) Letter from Irene D. Mullock regarding air-conditioning for schools.
- (d) Letter from CT Siting Council regarding modification to exiting communication facility at 58A Montano Road.
- (e) Letter from CT Siting Council regarding approval of revised landscape plan – fuel cell at 1835 Hebron Avenue at Chalker Hill.
- (f) Letter from the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority regarding low-income housing tax credit for Center Village.

Motion By: Mr. Gullotta **Seconded By:** Mrs. Barry
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adds to their agenda a discussion of the Board of Education request for a study of Air Conditioning for various school buildings.

Disc: Vice Chairman Osgood stated that this is on the agenda for the second week of January.

Result: Motion carries by the following vote {7-2-0}.

For: Chairman Beckett, Mrs. Barry, Ms. Boisvert, Mr. Byar, Mr. Finn, Mr. Gullotta and Mrs. Keefe

Against: Vice Chairman Osgood and Mr. Cavanaugh

Abstain: None

Mr. Gullotta said he understood the concerns of the Board and suggested they consider appropriating \$50,000 for the study. Mr. Cavanaugh said if there was a motion, it should be specific to include all cooling options. Mrs. Barry said that they have been clear in the recent Board of Education meetings that they intend to look at all cooling options. Ms. Boisvert asked about the source of the funding to which Mr. Johnson said that it would come from the Cap Reserve Fund Undesignated Fund Balance. Mr. Byar supported that it be clear for all options and questioned why the Board of Education didn't appropriate their surplus to the project. He

asked if they could recover this from their CIP. Mr. Johnson said that if it is funded now, it would not be allocated until July 1, 2016, and the goal is not to rule out a referendum in November, 2016. Mr. Byar asked more about the process. Mr. Johnson outlined it emphasizing that it may take more funding to get the appropriate level of detail for a referendum. Mr. Finn supported the allocation saying that it is important to the Board of Education and it should be important to the Town Council. He advocated for getting the information they need instead of kicking the can down the road.

Motion By: Mr. Gullotta **Seconded By:** Ms. Boisvert

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers the request for an allocation of \$50,000 to be used for a study on all air conditioning possibilities at the public schools, to the Board of Finance for a funding report and recommendation; and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 12, 2016 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury, to consider said appropriation and transfer.

Disc: Vice Chairman questioned if this could be more like \$150,000 or \$200,000. Mr. Johnson said he didn't think it would be \$150,000 but that it could be more than \$50,000. Mr. Finn said that whether they spend it today or tomorrow, it will be spent and suggested they get it done. Vice Chairman Osgood noted that the Board of Education took a vote not to spend \$25,000 of Board money for the study. He questioned if two weeks would make a difference suggesting they vote on it January 12, 2016. Mr. Johnson said that they need to go through the process to get a consultant on board in order to make a November referendum and if they are able to save two weeks, so much the better. Mr. Byar also commented on the Board of Education not supporting the study with funding but said he would support the effort. Mrs. Barry said it was necessary and she would support the motion. Mr. Cavanaugh said he was troubled by mid-year projects and expressed concern about not sending the total to referendum instead of picking here and there. He said he wouldn't support it. Mrs. Keefe said that she agrees it is important.

Result: Motion carries by the following vote {7-2-0}.

For: Chairman Beckett, Mrs. Barry, Ms. Boisvert, Mr. Byar, Mr. Finn, Mr. Gullotta and Mrs. Keefe

Against: Vice Chairman Osgood and Mr. Cavanaugh

Abstain: None

10. Minutes

(a) Minutes of November 10, 2015 Council Regular and Organizational Meeting.

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes as submitted for the regular meeting held November 10, 2015.

Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

11. Appointments and Resignations.

(a) Resignation of Lillian A. Tanski as an Alternate member of the Town Plan & Zoning Commission (R-2017).

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council accepts the resignation of Lillian A. Tanski as an Alternate member of the Town Plan & Zoning Commission (R-2017).
Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

(b) Appointments to various boards and commissions (if available).

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the following appointments:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>BOARD, COMMISSION, COMMITTEE</u>	<u>TERM</u>
Linda DeGross	Community Beautification Committee	Reappointment (R-2019)
Mark Babineau	Community Beautification Committee	Reappointment (U-2019)
Carol Ahlschlager	Fair Rent Commission	Reappointment (R-2019)
Marti Curtiss	Fair Rent Commission	Reappointment (R-2019)
Judith A. Stearns	Fair Rent Commission	Reappointment (R-2019)
Clement J. Pontillo	Incorporators/Free Academy	Reappointment (R-2021)
Robert J. Hager	Insurance Advisory Committee	Reappointment (R-2017)
Ben Kehl	Insurance Advisory Committee	Reappointment (R-2017)
Jason Smith	Recreation Commission	Reappointment (R-2019)
Michael H. Clinton	Recreation Commission	Reappointment (R-2019)
Michael Botelho	Town Plan & Zoning Commission	Reappointment (R-2019)
Sharon Purtill	Town Plan & Zoning Commission	Reappointment (R-2019)
Jay Boothroyd	Town Plan & Zoning Commission-Alternate	Reappointment (R-2019)
Robert Lynn	Water Pollution Control	Reappointment (R-2019)
James Parry	Water Pollution Control	Reappointment (R-2019)
Irene Newquist	Welles Turner Library	Reappointment (R-2019)

Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

Motion By: Mr. Gullotta ***Seconded By:*** Mr. Cavanaugh
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the following appointments:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Board, Commission, Committee</u>	<u>Term</u>
Denise Weeks	Commission on Aging	Reappointment (D-2019)
Janeen Dolan	Commission on Aging	Reappointment (D-2019)
Raymond Dolan	Economic Development Commission	Reappointment (D-2019)
Sridhar Kadaba	Economic Development Commission	New Appt (D-2019)
James Hagen	Ethics Commission – Regular Member	New Appt (D-2019)
Anthony Gesnaldo	Ethics Commission – Alternate Member	New Appt (D-2019)
Robert Zanolungo	Fair Rent Commission	New Appt (D-2019)
Charles F. Murray	Fair Rent Commission	New Appt (D-2019)
Adam Fleisher	Housing Code of Appeals	New Appt (D-2017)
Charles F. Murray	Housing Code of Appeals	New Appt (D-2017)
David Peniston II	Human Relations Commission	New Appt (D-2019)
David Hoopes	Insurance Advisory Committee	Reappointment (D-2017)
Jaye Winkler	Insurance Advisory Committee	Reappointment (D-2017)
William Wulftange	Insurance Advisory Committee	New Appt (D-2017)
Matthew Saunig	Public Buildings Commission	New Appt (D-2019)
Patricia V. Low	Town Plan & Zoning Commission	Reappointment (D-2019)
Lawrence Niland	Town Plan & Zoning Commission-Alternate	New Appt (D-2019)
William O’Keefe	Water Pollution Control Authority	Reappointment (D-2019)
Anne Gershkoff Borman	Youth & Family Services Commission	Reappointment (D-2019)
Chris Gullotta	Youth & Family Services Commission	New Appt (D-2019)

Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

12. Executive Session.

(a) Potential property acquisition.

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters executive session at 11:21 pm for the purposes of discussing a potential property acquisition.
Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

Present for the executive session were Town Council Members: Dr. Stewart Beckett, III, Chairman, Mr. Whit C. Osgood, Vice Chairman, Mrs. Jill Barry, Ms. Karen Boisvert, Mr. Lawrence J. Byar, Mr. Cavanaugh, Mr. William Finn, Mr. Gullotta and Mrs. Cara Keefe with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson.

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby exits executive session at 11:29 pm.
Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

13. Adjournment

Motion By: Mr. Cavanaugh **Seconded By:** Mr. Gullotta
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns their regular meeting of December 1, 2015, at 11:30pm.
Result: Motion passes unanimously {9-0-0}.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly Meanix Miller

Kimberly Meanix Miller
Recording Clerk

Stewart Beckett, III
Chairman